

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT TACOMA

ROBERT LUCAS WOODWARD,

Petitioner,

v.

JASON BENNETT,

Respondent.

CASE NO. 3:24-cv-05540-JHC

ORDER

Before the Court are Petitioner's Motions for Relief from Judgment at Dkt. # 7 and Dkt. # 8. Both are meritless, form, fill-in-the-blank style motions under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b)(4).

The motion at Dkt. # 7 says that the Court failed to conduct a de novo review of "Petitioner's REQUEST FOR CERTIFICATION." Presumably, the motion is referring to the denial of a certificate of appealability. But Petitioner failed to object to the Report and Recommendation (R&R), Dkt. # 4, which recommends that the Court deny such a certificate. And in any event, the Court did review the issue de novo.

The motion at Dkt. # 8 says that the Court failed to conduct a de novo review of "Petitioner's MOTION FOR STAND-BY COUNSEL." But the R&R (to which Petitioner did

1 not object), the order adopting it, Dkt. # 5, and the judgment thereon, Dkt. # 6, have nothing to
2 do with any such motion.

3 In light of the foregoing, the Court DENIES both motions. And if Petitioner files another
4 patently meritless, form, fill-in-the-blank style motion, the Court may enter a Notice of Intent to
5 Enter Bar Order Against Vexatious Litigation, which order would restrict Petitioner in this
6 litigation.

7 Dated this 31st day of December, 2024.

8
9 

10 John H. Chun
11 United States District Judge
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24